

Appl. No. 10/064,971
Amdt. dated July 10, 2006
Reply to Office action of April 28, 2006

Amendments to the Drawings:

Three pages of replacement drawing sheets are attached, having figures 1-6 printed thereon. These figures are duplicates of what was originally submitted. Acceptance of the drawings is respectfully requested.

5

Attachment: Replacement Sheets

3 pages

10

Appl. No. 10/064,971
Amdt. dated July 10, 2006
Reply to Office action of April 28, 2006

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1. Rejection of claims 1-3, 7-9, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a):

Claims 1-3, 7-9, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yanagida et al. (US 5,775,918, Yanagida hereinafter) in view of DesForges et al. (US 5,085,587, DesForges hereinafter).

Response:

Claim 1 has been amended to distinguish from the cited prior art. Claim 1 now contains the limitation of "not printing data onto the document with the printer when the document already has the printing sign". This amendment is supported in paragraph [0034] of the instant application, and no new matter has been added.

The printing method of the present invention checks uses a sensor located on a printer to see if a document contains a printing sign. When a document that already has the printing sign is inserted into the printer, the printer does not print data onto the printer, and the document is ejected. On the other hand, when a document that does not have the printing sign is inserted into the printer, the printer prints data onto the document and then prints the printing sign onto the document.

Neither Yanagida nor DesForges teach "not printing data onto the document with the printer when the document already has the printing sign", as is claimed in the currently amended claim 1. Although Yanagida and DesForges teach marking incorrect answers when a correct answer is not present, neither teach detecting the presence of a printing sign, and not printing data onto the document with the printer when the document already has the printing sign. Therefore, claim 1 is patentably distinguished from the cited prior art.

Appl. No. 10/064,971
Amdt. dated July 10, 2006
Reply to Office action of April 28, 2006

Claims 2-14 are dependent on claim 1, and should be allowed if claim 1 is allowed. Reconsideration of claims 1-14 is respectfully requested.

5 Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Sincerely yours,

10 Winston Hsu Date: July 10, 2006

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526
P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.
Voice Mail: 302-729-1562
Facsimile: 806-498-6673
15 e-mail : winstonhsu@naipo.com

Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. (The time in D.C. is 12 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 9 PM in Taiwan.)